



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 March 2021

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J3720/D/20/3264346

Leet Cottage, Shuckburgh Road, Priors Marston CV47 7RS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Pike against the decision of Stratford-on-Avon District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01405/FUL, dated 2 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and insertion of window in side elevation to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and insertion of window in side elevation to facilitate loft conversion at Leet Cottage, Shuckburgh Road, Priors Marston CV47 7RS, in accordance with application Ref: 20/1405/FUL, dated 2 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Site Location Plan, Existing and Proposed Block Plan, Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations Drawing Number 465 - 100 Rev E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has altered the description of development. This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposals and have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Priors Hardwick Conservation Area (CA) and the effect of the proposal upon the setting of a neighbouring listed building known as Moreton Cottage.

Reasons

Effect upon host property

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end terrace dwelling located within a CA. It has a simple stone appearance and on its rear is an existing single storey rear extension which covers approximately half of the rear elevation. The Council contend that the property can be viewed as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The proposed development would extend across almost the entire width of the dwelling. However, it would have a sympathetic appearance including the use of matching stone and extensive glazing. There would be no removal of historic fabric or architectural features and its translucent nature would permit views of the rear of the dwelling and an appreciation of its historic and architectural form. As such, I find that the proposed development would not unacceptably diminish the character, appearance or integrity of the host property.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and would accord with Policies CS.8, CS.9 and CS.20 of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy (2016) (CS) which, amongst other things, seek to protect and enhance non-designated heritage assets, high quality architectural design and for alterations to buildings to be of an appropriate scale and subservient in relation to the existing building. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Setting of listed building

7. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.
8. Whilst the host property is not listed it forms part of a row of listed cottages whose significance is derived from their architectural, historic and group value that positively contributes to the rural character of the village and the Shuckburgh Road frontage. This significance has been diminished to some extent through extensions to the rear of a number of properties but their rear gardens and the open land beyond still reinforce their domestic rural character.
9. The extent of the setting of a heritage asset is not fixed and may change and be experienced differently as the asset and its surroundings evolve. I acknowledge that the appeal property adjoins Moreton Cottage resulting in a physical and visual relationship between them. However, the modest size of the rear gardens and the existence of boundary planting means that the cottages are not viewed or experienced in the same manner. Despite being sited close to Moreton Cottage, the proposed extension for these reasons would not dominate or overwhelm its setting and therefore would have a negligible effect upon its setting.
10. I conclude that the proposed extension would not adversely affect but preserve the setting of the neighbouring listed building. It would accord with Policy CS.8 of the CS which, amongst other things, seeks to protect and enhance designated heritage assets. It would also accord with the Framework.

Effect upon Conservation Area

11. The CA is characterised by a historic road layout and green spaces that extend through the village and surround the built form that contributes to its rural character. This rural landscape provides a verdant setting for a number of attractive buildings in the village.
12. A public footpath extends along one side of the appeal site and whilst the proposed extension would extend across most of the rear of the property it would not be highly visible from the public realm. Views of it would be localised and glimpsed due to the height of the existing boundary fence, garden building and electrical substation and the position of existing landscaping. Moreover, its scale and form would not unduly affect the host property and its appearance using sympathetic materials including Horton Stone would not be uncharacteristic of buildings in the CA.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would accord with Policies CS.8, CS.9 and CS.20 of the CS which, amongst other things, seek to protect and enhance the wide range of historic and cultural assets that contribute to the character and identity of the District and high quality architectural design that preserves and enhances the character of the locality. It would also accord with the Framework.

Conditions

14. I have considered the imposition of conditions in accordance with the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawing as this provides certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary to ensure the proposed development has a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above the appeal succeeds.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR